

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 433

CE 007 171

TITLE Cooperative Day of Planning IV: A Report on the Fourth Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (San Antonio, Texas, April 17-18, 1971).

INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 18 Apr 71

NOTE 41p.; For related documents, see CE 007 171-175

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; *Conference Reports; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Needs; Educational Problems; National Organizations; Speeches; State Agencies; *Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS NACVE; National Advisory Councils on Vocational Ed; SACVE; State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

A summary of the proceedings of the 1971 joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (SACVE and NACVE) is presented. The meeting was attended by representatives from 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The summary includes the following areas covered in the meeting: (1) resolutions acted upon--background information and actions requested in support of the Occupational Education Act of 1971, establishment of an ad hoc committee for suggestions and appropriate action, a SACVE's request for a meeting of the State and national advisory councils in Washington; (2) summary of discussion on areas of mutual concern--the NACVE public information project, regional efforts of SACVEs, discussion groups on issues concerning advisory councils, and a summary of reaction and platform speeches; and (3) the texts of five speeches concerning current critical issues in vocational education. A list of participants is included. (EC)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED123433

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING IV

A Report on the Fourth Joint Meeting of the State and National
Advisory Councils on Vocational Education
April 17-18, 1971 San Antonio, Texas

CE0071717

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING IV
A Report on the Fourth Joint Meeting of the State and National
Advisory Councils on Vocational Education
April 17-18, 1971 San Antonio, Texas

CONTENTS

Introduction

Summary of Major Resolutions Acted Upon

- . Legislation
 - Background
 - Discussions
- . Ad Hoc Committee for Suggestions and Appropriate Action
- . State Advisory Council Requests

Summary of Discussion on Areas of Mutual Concern

- . NACVE Public Information Project
- . Regional Efforts of SACVEs
- . Discussion Groups: Methodology and Decision-Making for SACVE Concerns
- . Summarization of Reaction and Platform Speakers

Texts of Speeches and Summary of Related Discussion

- . Remarks by Mr. David Colburn, President, DECA, High School Division
- . Remarks by Dr. Arthur Lee Hardwick, Associate Commissioner, BAVTE
- . Remarks by Mr. Frank McGettrick, Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Schools
- . Remarks by the Honorable Roman Pucinski, Congressman of Illinois
- . Concluding Remarks by Mr. Lawrence Davenport, Chairman, NACVE

List of Delegates in Attendance

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING IV

A Summary of the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory
Councils on Vocational Education, April 17-18, 1971
San Antonio, Texas

INTRODUCTION

The State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, created by Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, were designed as independent boards to advise on the planning, operation and evaluation of vocational education throughout the country. At the time of their creation, the State and National Advisory Councils agreed that it would be mutually beneficial to meet semi-annually to discuss major issues and exchange information and ideas. The first joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils was held in November, 1969, the second in May, 1970 and the third in November, 1970.

The Fourth Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was held in San Antonio, Texas on April 17-18, 1971. Attended by representatives of forty-eight States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, the meeting basically focused on policy and strategy formation. Major speakers included: Dr. Arthur Lee Hardwick, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, the Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, Congressman of Illinois, and Mr. David Colburn, President of DECA, High School Division. In addition, a series of platform speakers, charged with the responsibility of assessing the progress of the Councils concerning their vocational education programs, and the nation in general addressed the group: Mr. F. R. Vihel, the SACVE executive director for Arizona, Mr. Richard Goshurt, the co-chairman for Indiana, Dr. Duane Lund, NACVE member and vocational education leader in Minnesota, Dr. Kenneth Hoyt, counselor-trainer and evaluator of the University of Maryland, Mr. Alton Ice, executive director for Texas, Dr. Robert White, executive director for South Carolina, Mr. DeForest Rall, executive secretary of North Dakota, Dr. Frank Gregory, Chairman of the District of Columbia, and Mr. Courtney Riley, executive director for Nevada. Letters from Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Commissioner of Education, and T. H. Bell, Deputy Commissioner for School Systems, indicating continued support of both the National and State advisory councils were also read. Attention during the meeting was directed to pending legislation, SACVE activities and developments, the NACVE public information project, and formation of new Council activities.

This report summarizes the main areas of concern of the meeting. It includes texts of all major resolutions and speeches, as well as a consolidation of thoughts gleaned from State advisory council speakers. It is my hope that this report will be useful to you in following the progress of the Advisory Councils and the topics with which they are concerned.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING IV
Summary of Resolutions Acted Upon

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RESOLUTIONS ACTED UPON

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

In terms of legislation, the Occupational Education Act of 1971, takes precedence for satisfying vocational education needs. What follows is a summary of background information on this bill, a summary of discussion on this bill, and action requested in support of this bill.

Background

On April 7, 1971, Congressman Albert Quie (R.-Minn), the ranking member of the House Committee on Education and Labor introduced the Occupational Education Act, joined by sixteen other Representatives who support this legislative measure:

Edith Green (D-Ore)
Ogden Reid (R-NY)
Roman Pucinski (D-Ill)
John Dellenback (R-Ore)
John Brademas (D-Ind)
Marvin Esch (R-Mich)
Edwin Eschleman (R-Pa)
William Steiger (R-Wisc)
Orval Hansen (R-Idaho)
John Dent (D-Pa)
Romano Mazzoli (D-Ky)
Edwin Forsythe (R-NJ)
Herman Badillo (D-NY)
John Kemp (R-NY)
Peter Peyser (R-NY)
John Buchanan (R-Ala)

The proposed legislation makes provision for expansion of post-secondary occupational education programs, strengthening the concept of occupational preparation, offering counseling and placement services in elementary and secondary schools as equalizers to academic preparation, and possibly most important, calls for the establishment of a Bureau of Occupational Education to administer the programs.

In introducing this bill, Congressman Quie expressed his deep concern over the present status of vocational education in our country, and explained his reasoning for formulating such a legislative measure, by stating:

"In my judgment this is an important bill because it addresses itself to vital but unfulfilled needs in America's educational system. Moreover, while the administration shares the concerns which this bill reflects and has been exploring with care the possibilities for further Federal legislation in this field, this bill is a congressional initiative."

As a result of this bill, vocational education would assume a totally new administrative structure within USOE. Intra-departmental coordination would provide for adequate development of subprofessional personnel needs in the health professions, and better communications with manpower training and other related programs in the Federal structure. Responsibilities of both the Secretary and the Commissioner under this bill are clearly spelled out. SACVEs are given the same authorities under this bill as they have under the Vocational Education Amendments. Private proprietary schools may participate on contract bases when utilization is more feasible. Job placement and counseling are considered intrinsic to the program, and evaluation at all levels is stressed.

Discussion

Congressman Pucinski (D-Ill.), a co-sponsor of the Occupational Education Act of 1971 (HR 7429), indicated that this bill was formulated to provide lawful assurance that there will be an agency within USOE which will "continue to propogate the principles that vocational education is good for every American kid who is in this country, whether he's going to college or not."

The National Advisory Council supports this bill because it makes provision for almost everything the Council reports recommended should be present for improving vocational education programs throughout our Nation. The Council plans to present testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee when hearings begin.

AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR SUGGESTIONS AND APPROPRIATE ACTION

The following resolution was passed by unanimous vote of State Advisory Council members:

In view of the fact that suggestions from the various discussion groups were not openly aired to other State advisory council members outside the respective groups, it was resolved that an Ad Hoc committee for suggestions, recommendations and comments that evolved from these group discussions be established to work closely with the National Advisory Council and its staff in carrying them out.

Motion was made to convene this committee in approximately a month to consider several suggestions which were timely and needed immediate attention. Mr. Joseph Clary, Executive Director of the North Carolina State Advisory Council, was elected to chair this committee, and act in the selection of other members to serve on this committee, in conjunction with the National Advisory Council.

SACVE REQUESTS

Mr. Simmons, a member of the SACVE of Mississippi, called for a meeting of the State and National advisory councils to be held in Washington. Such a meeting would give the State councils opportunity to speak with their congressional and senatorial representatives. While no date was set for such a meeting, the National Advisory Council is considering such action presently.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ON AREAS OF MUTUAL CONCERN

NACVE PUBLIC INFORMATION PROJECT

Mr. Walter Woodhull, Consultant, NACVE, spoke of redefining vocational education, not necessarily altering it, through the best possible media available. Using materials to stimulate interest in vocational education is not enough, according to Mr. Woodhull. Rather, an effective communications center which provides good channeling and delivery systems is imperative to serving the needs of vocational education and redefinition. This image enhancement project hopes to draw the many diverse types of people into a vocational education program that correctly suits their specific needs.

Five one-minute films were shown: an area technical school in Atlanta; a health occupations program in New Jersey; a co-op program in Cleveland; "A Place For You In Indiana Vocational Education" project; and a description of the new look in career education in Oregon.

Responses to these films are filtered back with personal letters, brochures listing various occupational programs, and names of directors and addresses of where these programs are being sponsored. feedback forms, as they are called, are sent to the director to whom the individual requesting information was referred. When returned to the Center, this form briefly explains what the person wanted and what he is presently doing.

Polls have also been taken to determine how informed people are to what vocational education is all about. In the State of Indiana, alone, 47% of the people polled did not have any concept of what vocational education means. After the public information materials are distributed, a post-survey is planned to determine the effectiveness of the program.

If these models do prove effective in informing the public to vocational education, then the National Advisory Council will release its efforts to a responsible agency to carry out the purposes of the project.

REGIONAL EFFORTS OF SACVEs

Mr. John Guemple, State Director of Vocational Education for Texas described the establishment of a permanent committee for vocational education, which meets monthly with the State Board of Education. This development is the result of passage of a State statute which sets forth duties, and authorizes staffing and membership of the State Advisory Council.

Mr. DeForest Rall, Executive Secretary of the SACVE for North Dakota, explained that in the past, the State Advisory Council did not feel that it was receiving communications from the State Department of Vocational Education in their State as rapidly as required. Therefore, at a SACVE meeting in Phoenix, fifteen States passed a resolution requesting that all informational materials stemming from the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education here in Washington be sent to the Executive Secretary of every SACVE. This resolution was received and approved by the Associate Commissioner, BAVTE, and at present the flow of communications to the States has readily increased as a result of this joint effort.

Mr. Courtney Riley, Executive Director of the SACVE for Nevada stated that by adopting some of the efforts that the Texas SACVE used in getting statute passage for their Council, the Nevada SACVE was also able to have the Manpower Training and Advisory Council for Career Education Advisory Act of 1971 adopted. The Act provides for changing the name of the Council from the Nevada State Vocational-Technical Education Advisory Council to the Advisory Council for Manpower Training and Career Education. Manpower delivery and manpower training terms are defined, and the Advisory Council is now authorized to evaluate career education and manpower training programs, recommend coordination of career education and manpower training programs, and advise other institutions or agencies engaged in manpower delivery service of State plan developments which call for comprehensive manpower systems under legislation dealing with manpower development and training. While these duties are not administrative or operational, and are recommendation, evaluation and advisory in nature, the Advisory Council is now legally constituted to handle all training programs or any future programs that would result from new Federal legislation of this type.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

On Saturday, after hearing speakers who were able to answer questions and provide valuable background information on pertinent subject areas, the session broke into five groups to discuss concerns emanating from this meeting, and develop methodologies regarding these issues. The groups were able to report:

Group I - (Arthur Walker - Virginia, F. R. Vihel- Arizona, Murle Hayden - Kansas, Truman Weller - Rhode Island, William Carroll, Clint Harris - Wyoming, Jesse Fulton - Ohio, Joe Tuma - Michigan, Henry Morgan, Dorthy Chambers - Alabama, Jack Higbee - Utah).

Major issues brought up by Group I included defining the role of the National Advisory Council in regards to SACVE functions, developing effective delivery systems for legislation transmittal from National to State Advisory Councils, and determining the NACVE position on MDTA.

Group II - (Andrew J. Moynihan - New Hampshire, Chairman)

Recommendations made by Group II included requesting full funding for vocational education and the SACVEs, appointing executive directors in each Federal region to assume responsibility for information dissemination to council members in each State of that region; and stipulating that HR 7429 provide for SACVE approval of comprehensive State plans for education if this bill does not already do so.

Group III - (Chalmers A. Cromer - Nebraska, Chairman)

Problems encountered by Group III included financing-accounting bottlenecks, as a result of funneling processes through State plan channels, and confusion arising over new terminologies never fully defined to the States (i.e. "career" education vs voc-ed). The group also suggested one-year terms for new appointees, simplification of State plans and council structure to assume emergency actions when necessary (i.e. legislation), and counselor orientation to the world of work.

Group IV - (Robert White - South Carolina, Bill Harrison - Tennessee, Joe Clary - North Carolina, Don Cargill, Charles McDaniel - Georgia, Bill Howard - Kentucky, Bruce Howell - Florida, Dick Collins - Vermont)

Group IV suggested issuing copies of Annual Evaluation Reports to appropriate committees in State legislatures, USOE, and NACVE, and called for closer examination of Council member certification by the Commissioner of Education, to insure that members qualify for the categories to which they are appointed. The group also encouraged action by State Boards on SACVE recommendations, more adequate representation on SACVEs under new legislation, and an information system linking SACVEs, NACVE, AVA, and USOE for more effective working relationships. In addition, the group advised future meetings be scheduled for the weekdays, reconsideration of the Annual Evaluation Report to USOE be made no earlier than December 1, that SACVEs coordinate the Fall 1971 Joint Meeting, that each State advisory council chairman and executive director have access to the agenda a minimum of two weeks prior to a meeting, and that objectionable features of the memorandum issued by Edwin Rumpf, BAVTE, be discussed with a representative SACVE ad hoc committee and either Secretary Richardson or Commissioner Marland to develop a more satisfactory statement in regards to that memorandum.

Group V - (George Milton, Terrence Jones - Oregon, Irwin and Elsie MacKay - Colorado, Charles Conway - Alaska, J. W. Helmstaedter - New Jersey, H. D. Buckingham - South Dakota, Robert Wallenstein - Washington, Larry Burwell, J. Walter Juckett, John Briscoe - New York, Gordon Kutscher, Billy Bruns - Missouri)

Group V recommended that funds for the National Advisory Council be increased to handle their demands for various services. Concern was indicated over low cost housing and current union practices that continue to bar many vocational students from work. Because the group felt that vocational education programs have an obligation to prepare students for possible mobility, more conformity in curriculum and training programs is, therefore, necessary in the different regions. The group also suggested that proprietary schools be a concern for evaluation, and that counseling in our nation be given more strength through involvement of other parties. The group requested establishing an ad hoc committee to create and maintain a central office that would service the communication and liaison needs of the State and National councils.

SUMMARY OF REACTION AND PLATFORM SPEAKERS

Mr. F. R. Vihel - SACVE, Executive Director of Arizona

Speaking from an industrial spokesman's viewpoint, Mr. Vihel called for a total community involvement that would strengthen vocational education concepts, and add a wealth of additional resources that the political and social aspects of the community can provide. Organizations such as Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA), can be a useful instrument in bridging community gaps, if they are utilized, not used as token indicators of vocational involvement.

Mr. Richard Goshurt - SACVE, Co-chairman of Indiana

As a vocational educator in agriculture, Mr. Goshurt emphasized the need for better public relations and promotional activities, as responsibilities to be assumed by the State advisory councils. It is not enough, according to Mr. Goshurt, to be merely an "advisory" council, if vocational education is to achieve its rightful status in this country. Rather, the SACVEs must also be promotional, and able to inform the people of their state about vocational education to the full extent of their resources. Citing the Public Information Project being directed by the National Advisory Council as a valuable tool with which to contact and inform the public, Mr. Goshurt pointed up that it is ultimately this group, the general people, the voters, who will determine the effectiveness of the State advisory councils as well as the route for vocational education. Therefore, efforts should be directed towards the public to supply accurate information and methods of handling their responses.

Dr. Duane Lund - NACVE, member

Adding to Mr. Goshurt's comments for better publicity needs, Dr. Lund stated that the State advisory councils also need to make an impact through lobbying on the local, State and national levels. It is imperative that the SACVEs place their weight where it will be most felt, and given the best response. This can be achieved through the personal approach of contacting and meeting with State legislators, and then the congressional representatives in Washington. Dr. Lund spoke also of image building for vocational education, but indicated that praising the programs or schools was not the total answer. Rather, the final product of these efforts, the student, must be given priority if vocational education is to succeed as a supplier to the nation's needs.

Dr. Kenneth Hoyt - Counselor-trainer and evaluator for the University of Maryland

Speaking briefly about his work with the State of Texas, Dr. Hoyt stressed the need for evaluation in Council activities as a main function which should not be overlooked for its value. Follow-up studies, in particular, were suggested as evaluative forms that the Councils should pursue when making evaluation studies.

Mr. Alton Ice - SACVE, Executive Director of Texas

The focus is finally being narrowed, the State advisory councils are getting to the heart of the matter, according to Mr. Ice. Citing Texas as an example, the SACVE has been successful in gaining recognition and action through the State legislature. Mr. Ice emphasized the need to create conducive climates for development of technical, vocational and manpower training within institutions, that will serve as indicators for industrial and economic growth. Salesmanship of this factor will gain more support for vocational education and assure that portion of our society which has been ill-informed or uninformed to vocational education.

Dr. Robert White - SACVE, Executive Director for South Carolina

If the financial resources and staffing levels of the SACVEs are to be raised, then the Councils must have a definite influence, but an influence not based on aggregation of parts, but of unified clout that indicates collective consensus. With one voice that is representative of all the State advisory councils, we can afford to speak, Dr. White stated. Steps in this direction can be achieved by strengthening inter-council communications and allowing the SACVEs to play a more active role in determining future agendas for the joint meetings of the State and National councils.

Mr. DeForest Rall - SACVE, Executive Secretary for North Dakota

Citing a resolution the North Dakota SACVE had passed calling for more frequent communications with BAVTE, Mr. Rall stressed not only increased needs for information dissemination but also information procurement. Turning to the issues of State plans, Mr. Rall suggested that teacher certification requirements be reviewed and school placement services become integrated as compulsory needs, and that if comprehensive educational programs become an actuality, then the Councils should be charged with responsibility for inculcating necessary changes in educational philosophies and redistribution of funds.

Dr. Frank Gregory - SACVE, Chairman for the District of Columbia

Speaking specifically about the five vocational high schools in Washington, Dr. Gregory pointed out the problems that have arisen over deciding whether to utilize these schools as skill centers, allowing the comprehensive high schools to avail themselves of the facilities, or have the students commute from their home schools. Discussing such a problem only emphasizes the duplication of programs, the overlaps and gaps which we all must face in making vocational education effective under any circumstances.

Mr. Courtney Riley - SACVE, Executive Director for Nevada

The State advisory council for Nevada, under the direction of Mr. Riley, set as its main goal last year to gain recognition and credibility with the State Board of Education, by, one, changing the composition of the Council to be more thoroughly representative of vocational education facets, and two, by granting more publicity to these Council members across the State. This was achieved, in light of the Act the Council was able to see passed that specifically gave the Council determined functions, and differences in attitude as to the Council's more authoritative position in the State now. Mr. Riley stated that the most important goal the SACVEs should direct themselves to at this time is seeking the amendment passage which would give the Councils full funding and an opportunity to work at capacity.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING IV

Texts of Speeches

TEXTS OF SPEECHES

The joint meeting of the State and National advisory councils was afforded the opportunity to hear a series of excellent speakers report on the critical issues of vocational education today.

Mr. David Colburn, President, DECA, High School Division, invited members of the State and National advisory councils to attend functions of the Annual DECA Conference that was also ongoing in San Antonio at this time. Dr. Arthur Lee Hardwick, Associate Commissioner for Bureau of Adult Vocational Technical Education, discussed the status of the career education models within USOE, as well as activities within the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education. Mr. Frank McGettrick, Assistant Deputy Commissioner for School Systems, spoke in lieu of Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland, Jr. in assuring the councils of their viable position within the U. S. Office of Education organ. Mr. McGettrick also clarified the Commissioner's feelings regarding the imperative need to implement career education. The Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, Congressman of Illinois, spoke about the failure in American education today and legislative enactments that would help to turn the tables around in favor of career and occupational education. Mr. Lawrence Davenport, Chairman, made the concluding remarks.

The following are texts of the speeches made before the joint meeting on April 17-18. The remarks of Dr. Hardwick, Mr. McGettrick and Congressman Pucinski are not included because they were made in an extemporaneous fashion in response to questions from the group. The length of such remarks deterred their publication.

MR. DAVID COLBURN, PRESIDENT, HIGH SCHOOL DIVISION, DECA

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of State and National Advisory Councils

I've never been to Texas before, but I'm supposed to welcome you to San Antonio, the site of what we believe is the greatest event of this year, the Silver Anniversary National Leadership Conference of the Distributive Education Clubs of America.

In your capacity, relative to the positions you hold in either the National or State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education, I am sure that you have seen the marked progress of DECA as it has grown over the last 25 years. On behalf of 125,000 young people, DECA members, we appreciate your continued aid and enthusiasm.



I'd like to say that you are in for a special treat if you see any of the activities going on this week, because, the young people of this conference are perhaps different from the young people you've been seeing on television lately. That is, that these 4,000 young people in attendance at this conference, are here for specific purposes. They are here to compete in the good ole American tradition in the way of competitive events. They are here to learn, and not only become leaders, but followers as well. They are also here to elect those particular persons who they would like to have as their National officers for next year. So, if you are going to drop in on any of the activities of NLC, I'd ask you to be prepared, to be fully prepared to see some very motivated people at this 25th Anniversary National Leadership Conference.

I'd ask for you to be prepared to see today's youth as they really are at this conference; to see young people participating in a healthy atmosphere, despite the so-called barriers of race, color and creed. We are planning for a future in this organization and believe me, when that future comes, it will be one that was well worth waiting for.

Finally, may I say that DECA poses a threat to society. Yes, a threat to that part of society, that segment of society who wishes to disrupt the idea of free enterprise and competition, the American System. The American way of life. I'd like to tell you that these people don't stand a chance.

Once again, welcome to San Antonio, and I hope that you benefit from this truly great event. Drop in at the convention center at your time, at your liking, and you will see how they operate. Thank you very much.

DR. ARTHUR LEE HARDWICK, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, BAVTE

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

It's my pleasure to be here. It's always nice to be back in Texas. As a former Texan, it's nice to come home.

A young lady from D.C. always questions me when I get up in front of a group and criticize Washington, D.C., so, I'll keep quiet. I'm very pleased to be here and I was pleased to see Dr. Templeton here. We were—I think they're doing some exciting things here at the University of Texas in San Antonio, and I'm looking for a lot to happen here in the future, in vocational and technical education.

As you know, today I wasn't planning to go into a lot as far as the Bureau. I thought the best thing to do was present an overview of what's happening in the Bureau, and then leave some time for questions relating to the Bureau and to vocational technical education.

I would like to point out some of the things that are happening at the present time. The Secretary's fact-finding conferences are started and there have been four of them. The last one was in Philadelphia this past week, Tuesday and Wednesday. I thought it went very well. I attended the first fact-finding conference in San Francisco, more than two and a half weeks ago; it went exceptionally well. I am very pleased that we're getting response.

The basic purpose of these fact-finding conferences was to give the Secretary of HEW, Secretary Richardson, more information about the advantages and the disadvantages of the vocational education system as it exists today. I think we need to provide him a lot of good information from these conferences, so he can make better policy decisions about vocational and technical education in the future.

I have had on many occasions a meeting with the Secretary where people were criticizing vocational education, but they never had the facts or they never had the viewpoint of the people in the field. This is one of the reasons that the Secretary's fact-finding conferences were to be held; we pushed that some of the information and some of the statistics that had been



gathered was not realistic. In many cases, it was very biased about vocational and technical education. I suggested that the Secretary get more in-depth information and it was his idea that we have these Secretary fact-finding conferences. I was very pleased that he had this much interest in finding out what was really happening in vocational and technical education.

I hope that you will participate in your conference in your area, if you have not already. I know some of them have. Last week, or this week, I saw quite a few of you in Philadelphia, and I was very pleased at the contribution that this group made in the conferences.

I hear the small group discussions, the group discussions went very well; they had some good points. Feel free to voice your opinions, and get these opinions into the final report. We are planning to present to the Secretary a final report--a report of each of the conferences--and then a final report of all the ten conferences. So, we should give him a great deal of information relating to vocational and technical education. We want the good points and the bad points. We're not trying to make a biased report to the Secretary; we want a realistic report. I think that's what we're striving for.

The next item I wanted to discuss was the career education models and we are planning in the Washington office, working with some states and some consultants in the field, career education. We have looked at vocational education in the past, and we have some areas that need improvement, but we have a lot of good points in vocational education, at the secondary level and at the post-secondary level. But, I continually get criticism in Washington about the fact that vocational education mainly, at the secondary school level, is not functioning and should be eliminated. I disagree with this point of view completely. I think we have some good points. We have some very fine programs in the field.

So, we decided to take the offensive and develop some career education models that would provide a better vocational education system for the future. What we started was take the good points of vocational education that are in the field, the exemplary programs, some of the programs that are not funded as exemplary programs, but yet have some very fine concepts. So, we've taken these ideas and drawn them into a model which we call the career education model. It is a program that starts at grade 1, and continues through grade 14. It is a continuous program and all students are involved in career education, career development all the way through. We start at grade 1 in the occupational orientation and this goes through the 5th or 6th grade, then into exploratory programs and then into your skill training and job clustering programs at the high school level.

At the end of high school, we're planning that the student has four basic options. The first would be going on to higher education; the second would be going on to post-secondary occupational education programs; the third

would be to a job and the fourth would be to an apprenticeship training program. We want to hold all of these options open and we want to provide a system that is flexible so they can move in and out of the system. I think this is the key to the model, is its flexibility, and its capability to adapt to change.

We are planning to have a heavy media development in the total model. This is one of the major concerns that it can adapt and take some of the developments that industry are presently using and the military, and utilize this media and these techniques in an educational system for grades 1 through 14.

We are in the process of developing the model and we hope to have it operational not in the next year, but soon after, and we plan that once the curricula material and the teacher education system has been developed, that it could be moved to other cities and other communities without major costs back to those communities.

I think this is one of the key points. We have to provide an educational system that can transfer to other cities or other communities without a major cost to those cities. This is one of the items that we have been working very hard with on the model, and major curriculum development will be funded through Federal dollars.

We have a lot of controversy about what is happening in Washington, some of the problems that have happened to the Bureau, what's happening to our staff, what's happening to our funds, and we were very concerned about the budget that was proposed. The House's new budget increases the President's budget by \$89,000,000, which is a very sizable increase. We saw the Hathaway Amendment defeated, and we were concerned when it was only defeated by four votes. I think the Congress is very much interested in improving the financial status of vocational education. The \$89,000,000 is a great help; however, I feel that we are only at the present time providing about 18 percent of the students with vocational and technical education. Why are we only providing the 18 percent?

Basically, it's a funding problem. We have funds available to the states, and they are heavily overmatched about five or six to one, and you wonder how we can only fund 18 percent. Well, I know all the states have problems. They cannot fund more programs or new facilities or new teachers. Their budgets are very limited. So, it comes to a basic problem of we need more money to improve the number of programs and the quality of these programs. I think the Congress is very concerned about this, and they are trying to do something for vocational education.

I become concerned, however, when I see in the field a lot of interest in vocational education and a lot of interest on the Hill, and then I see our people in the field continually fighting. I was in Wichita giving a speech about two or three weeks ago. I got caught up in a battle that they have going on in the state between the area vocational schools and the junior colleges. I guess it's typical in some other states, but they ask me about the junior colleges, and I made a statement to the press the night before

which I would make again. I made the statement that the area vocational schools in this country would have never been developed if the junior colleges in this country had been providing the needed occupational education ten years ago. And, I think that if the junior colleges would have provided the type of program that we needed at that point in time, we would not have had the area vocational schools.

I am concerned that we have a continuous fight between these types of institutions, and I am not concerned whether we have a comprehensive high school or an area vocational school or a junior college. I am after a comprehensive vocational education program, wherever it's at. It doesn't have to be in a junior college; it doesn't have to be in an area vocational school. It can be out in industry as far as I'm concerned. Let's quit fighting about what type of institution we're concerned with and start being more concerned with providing a comprehensive educational program. That's what we're going to have to work towards.

I see a lot of good people working in the field. I'm a city boy by background and I've never been--I take that back. I've been on one farm in my life, Don McDowell, I was in Wisconsin, and he took me to his farm in Wisconsin and that was my first experience. So, I have very little knowledge about the field of agriculture. At some points in my life, maybe I have been slightly critical of some of the programs in agriculture, but no more critical than I have been of technical education programs where I come from. And, I am not overly critical of any program, I hope, and I want us to improve and enhance those programs.

But, I have seen the field of agriculture trying to grow, trying to move, trying to change. If all vocational education would put the effort in that vocational agriculture is doing today, I would be glad to stand up and work for you any day of the week. I was always critical of the system that agriculture had many years ago, back when I was in a state office, but they know how to move. And, we should be proud of this group. I've seen the business educators starting to move. I've seen some of the technical educators starting to move. I think we're going to have to start moving together as a unit, and stop working as separate entities where agriculture and business and tech-ed work separately. Vocational education is a program in total, and I hate to hear these people stand up and say I'm a vocational agricultural man or I'm a technical education man, or I'm a business education man. I like for them to stand up and say I'm a vocational education man and I'm proud of it.

I think this is one of our basic problems in this country, that we're too fragmented between some of the programs that are in vocational education. I think some of the people around this country would like to keep it that way, keep us fighting between our programs, and keep a battle going between trade and industrial education and agriculture or other fields.

I got criticized when I re-organized the division of vocational, technical

education in Washington, and by no means I wanted to cause the field of T and I any problems. I was trying to enhance their role in the Office of Education. But, I left out the terminology, trade and industrial education, out of the new organizational chart. It wasn't in the old one, but I left it out of the new one, anyway.

But, I tried to provide for trade and industrial education not only one area, but we tried to provide construction, transportation, many other areas, provide a more, broader spectrum for trade and industrial education. But I was criticized very heavily by this group, and, criticism never bothers me, and I kind of relish it sometimes. But, I was concerned that it caused a division between some of our people, that they thought that we were trying to isolate or take them out of their role in vocational education. This was not the intent of leaving their name off of the organization chart. I became very concerned when I realized that they were uptight about leaving their name off, because it was never on there before, and I asked these people what did they actually want. And they just said that they wanted the term trade and industrial education on the organization chart.

I've been in industry for quite a few years, and I may be back before too long. I was in industry and I was talking to one of the executive vice-presidents of RCA at one time, and he asked me just what is vocational education and why did we need to hire--I was always pushing that we should hire more students from the voc-ed program--he said I really can't relate to one of them, I don't know what they're talking about when they say home economics, but I don't see that fitting into the company in any way. So, what's trade and industrial education. I think I can see a little bit what technical education is, but it's pretty vague, and they were concerned about how they relate it to vocational education. How does T and I fit into the industry that they have? Where do we put a T and I man; where does he fit?

I think this is one of the areas that I was concerned about when I came in the Office; I wanted to see something that industry could relate to. That's why I was trying to enhance trade and industrial education by giving them more in terms of construction and transportation and all the other areas that we've provided for T and I. So, we were trying to provide them a way to relate to the industries that they were trying to serve.

I see a lot of knowledgeable and concerned people about vocational education in the field. I am pleased to see this. I wish we had more. I see a lot of people that are theoretically concerned but lack the knowledge, and this bothers me.

I think we have a lot of people that know what they're talking about in terms of vocational education and are ready to voice their opinion about

vocational education. I want this. I want you to stand up and say this is right and this is wrong. There's not enough people who are willing to stand up in their own state and say that's wrong. We need to change it.

How many times have your councilmen passed two months of their last meetings, sit up and say this is not right in our state; are we going to change it, are we going to change it, are we going to improve this. Or, do we sit back in our easy chairs and council meetings and say well, we're going to evaluate the program in the state, or we are going to look at better programs, we're going to help them expand.

How many times do you look at the program that you have and say these are wrong; we need to change them. We can't continue to exist in vocational education if we do not change. Change should be our key word. Industry changes every day of the week. I got my doctorate, you know, and I said boy, I'm through with education. The biggest mistake I ever made in my life. I went about a year later to industry, the computer industry. It was very fast-moving. Every month that I was in that industry, I was in-- every week out of that month, I was in an education program of some type. I thought my education had just begun. I was concerned about why I thought well, after I got all through this formal education, I'd stopped learning. This cannot continue. Our people, our teachers need to be continually updated. Our administrators, you people, should be continually involved with upgrading your own knowledge about vocational education and upgrading your knowledge about what's going on in industry.

Our teachers out in the field, I see a lot of them who are good teachers and who were good teachers ten years ago, but I sometimes become concerned about whether they're good teachers today. They are good teachers and they try hard, but they are still teaching the same thing they taught ten years ago. If that's a good teacher, we don't need good teachers like that.

I think we have to look at a teacher education system that will provide a rotation or some type of inter-relationship with industry where our people can go back to industry and get more experience in the field. We have to have some system where our teachers can get more knowledge of what's going on in industry today, not ten years ago, not fifteen years ago; I see all these requirements around some of which stipulate in the state plans, you will have a BS degree in such and such and three years doing the same dang thing for three straight years, or whether it's three years that would give you sufficient background to teach the subject that you have to teach. All they are concerned about is you have three years of industrial experience.

If this is the type of experience we need for our teachers, something's lacking. We need to rotate these people where they have a knowledge of what they are going to teach, not just three years of industrial experience. If we just need three years of industrial experience for that reason, just to have it on paper, I see no value of having it on the paper.

I see some activity in teacher education. I see some interest. I was talking to Dr. Templeton last night, and some of his ideas about drawing teacher education in with industry in the higher education environment. Very interesting and I hope they continue these ideas.

I would like to see more of this type of program. I would like to see more teacher educators. I gave a speech in Philadelphia on Wednesday, and I criticized the teacher education institution pretty heavily. A couple of teacher educators walked up to me later and said, I was sorry that I'm a teacher educator, but I know we need to change.

But, if you just are sorry that you're a teacher educator, not concerned about how you are going to change, I become concerned. Sitting back and saying well, we're not the way we should be, or we could improve, but not trying to improve; I'm not the least bit wanting to help these people.

The whole system, educational system in this country, has to be changed, in my opinion. I think this group right here has the answer. I think vocational education is the answer to this educational system throughout the country. We have to provide a better educational system and career education or vocational education is the answer.

I get a lot of talk in Washington about career education and I get a lot of talk about occupational education. They say we need to get rid of the old term vocational education. Bad image. It really doesn't portray what we want to do in the future. Yet, they continue to cut our budget or cut our people.

How can you improve an image? I'm not for throwing away the term vocational education. I kind of like it, myself. I'm--I like the term career education and I like the term occupational education. But, I don't see throwing away a title just because somebody up there wants to improve the image, and they don't want to put the dollar with it or the people with it to do the change.

You can continue to change terms around the country, and you can give it any type of title you want. But until you are ready to support it and make it what it is, that title's not going to mean a dang thing. I think we have to face one basic fact: We're not funded and we're not supported the way we should be. And, until we get the support, and until we get this activity, we're not going to enhance our programs a great deal. I know we're getting a lot of good people in the field coming up with good ideas and improving their programs.

But, until we get this support and this money and these people, we're going to still be hitting only 18 percent of our student population. We should be hitting at least 60 percent of our student population. I don't

think that we're going to do it with the type of support that we have at the present time. I'm proud to be a vocational educator and I'm proud to be working with this group. I'll stand up and fight for this group as long as they want to move and improve their programs any day of the week, and I think you should be willing to stand up and do the same thing.

Thank you very much.

MR. FRANK MCGETTRICK, ASSISTANT DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

Good morning. I first wish to thank you for simply a few minutes of your time, and that's all I plan to use, because I know my appearance here imposes upon your agenda.

I bring apologies from both Commissioner Marland and Deputy Commissioner Bell, neither of whom could be here because of other business. Both men have asked me to convey their best wishes to you and to wish you the success of a wholly productive meeting.

I am not a vocational educator. In fact, I'm not an educator at all. And, to confess further, even as a student I wasn't terribly successful. We've all heard of the person who gets out of college by the skin of his teeth; well, when I got out, I didn't have any skin left.

You are probably wondering, my having made this statement, what is someone with such shabby educational credentials doing here. Particularly, here in the capacity of representing the United States Commissioner of Education. Well, the Commissioner asked me to be here today because I have had, fortunately, considerable exposure to and involvement in the development of program policy at the Federal level, even though I'm not an educator. I have been engaged in and around the area of policy for the past several years. I was a special assistant to James Allen, when he was Commissioner. I've had a close association with Ted Bell for the past year. And I've also worked closely with Dr. Marland and his staff since Dr. Marland has been Commissioner.

So, while not a card-carrying member of the educational fraternity, the Commissioner felt that with a reasonably broad background in Federal policy development, plus good familiarity with his personal educational philosophy I could sort of serve maybe as a credible witness in discussion briefly of three points with you today.

These are three items on which the Commissioner has specifically asked me to share his views with you. They will only take a couple of minutes:



Number one is the concern which has been expressed over what appeared to be a recommendation in the Commissioner's Annual Report that the Council on Vocational Education be abolished. I can assure you that this is not the Commissioner's intention at all.

The study of advisory councils which the report referred to is intended to make more effective, the entire advisory council system by modifying or eliminating overlapping or otherwise duplicative kinds of responsibilities of some of these groups.

The Vocational Education Advisory Board would certainly not be eligible for elimination under these kinds of criteria, since the functions of the Vocational Advisory Council simply do not overlap with those of others. So, this was a bit of confusion, I think probably because of the way the study was presented in the report, and partially due, too, to the fact that the report was fairly hastily put together.

Although, I must admit from a bureaucratic point of view that this year's report, I think, impressed me in makeup more than any of the other annual reports Commissioners have put out. I think there has been, I don't know if it's a stylistic change or something, but it's simply a much more readable kind of document.

Now, the second point on which Dr. Marland wishes to give you his assurance is on his strong dedication to and belief in vocational education. He has no intention of downgrading vocational education in the Office of Education. On the contrary, he wishes to see it take a stronger and more meaningful place in American education. He believes that with the technological and societal advances mounting ever so rapidly in this country, and for that matter, the world over, vocational education has a more vital role to play than ever before. The Commissioner is looking with anticipation to an analysis and a report of the regional conferences which Lee Hardwick is now holding and in which, I am sure, many of you are participating as well.

Dr. Marland is of the opinion that this feedback will do much to provide valuable insight into the needs and future directions of the vocational education field.

The third and final thing I was asked to mention here is career education. It is intended to supplant vocational education, and if not, just what is career education all about?

You probably recall that the term career education first appeared, I guess, with some comment in a speech that the Commissioner made in Houston. I have had a hand in looking at and seeing response to and writing a lot of speeches for at least two Commissioners, and I haven't been able to figure out what the reason is for the response to this speech.

First of all, there was tremendous popular response to the Houston speech. I would rank it certainly out of par with the response that Commissioner Allen got to the right to read speech that he made up in Los Angeles. There was also tremendous popular response to that.

But, the Houston speech, at the same time, seemed to raise a lot of confusion in the minds of the people. I read that speech several times and have tried to figure out why with so much popular response, so much confusion exists at the same time. In a personal analysis, I guess I probably reached the point where there were so many conceptual kinds of things discussed in that speech. Maybe they just sort of all melted together and this caused some people to have some confusion upon either hearing it or reading it.

Let me simply say first that career education as Commissioner Marland envisioned it is certainly not meant to replace vocational education. In fact, if anything, it will enhance vocational education and bring it much more sharply to sort of the center stage than has been the case thus far. Now, how you say? Let me try to explain in sort of an outline kind of fashion what the Commissioner means by career education. I think some of the pieces will begin to fall in place.

The central core of most secondary programs today is something called general education. The Commissioner has made this point. Dr. Marland would say of this that this being general education, it is a large waste of the student's time and energy. Because, for the most part, with a couple of exceptions, it doesn't teach the student to do anything. In fact, it fails to impart three things which are rapidly becoming absolutely essential for living a productive life in this society.

The first thing it fails to impart is knowledge of what is needed in the world of work and everything that goes with the world of work, too. The second thing it doesn't impart is knowledge of how to select an option or career choice, if you will. And, the third thing that it doesn't impart is knowledge or skill to perform that option in a productive and self-satisfying kind of way.

The Commissioner believes a better way to impart these three types of essential knowledge or skills or combinations thereof, is to sort of remove the general education hub of the wheel at the secondary level, and replace it with a career education hub; and, conduct all education at the secondary level employing the career focus.

This kind of secondary education focus you know, has many implications and modifications for public education across the board. To list just a few, pre-secondary education, for instance, would have to provide a

very solid and substantial educational base. Services such as guidance and counseling services at the secondary level would have a greatly expanded and vital and substitutive kind of role to play, in pursuing this notion of career education.

The four principal areas of basic academic type of curriculum, math, science, social studies and english would have to be examined very carefully for possible modification and adaptation to the notion of career. I am sure that there are many other facets of public education which would also require a careful analysis for adaptation to this sort of umbrella concept of career education, but Commissioner Marland would be the first to admit that at this point, career education is at sort of the philosophical starting gate. And, his intention is that with the help of groups such as yours, he can encourage it to leave that gate and get started, however, slowly around the track.

I said at the outset I didn't want to take up too much of your time. I know you have important business before you. It was a pleasure to be here this morning. Thank you.

HONORABLE ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

Thank you very much for your invitation to address this joint meeting of the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. When Congress created your councils in the Vocational Amendments of 1968, we conceived of you as being in the forefront of the modernization we hoped to bring to vocational education. And during the two years since the Amendments you have not disappointed us.



I would especially like to commend the National Advisory Council which has produced four excellent reports which I believe will serve as the leading guides to Congress in our future efforts.

My Subcommittee also appreciates the invaluable assistance given to us during the past two years by the Executive Director of the Council, Cal Dellefield.

I would also like to commend the State Advisory Councils. I have been reading your annual reports and I can assure you that they have been of invaluable assistance to me and to the Subcommittee in preparing for our hearings on occupational education this summer.

Those hearings will focus on the Office of Education and what is being done to deal with the following tragic facts.

Today almost five million Americans are currently unemployed and looking for work. The national unemployment rate is currently higher than at any time in the last ten years. Youth unemployment nationally approaches 20 per cent and, for non-white youth, it is approaching a 40 percent rate. Many thousands of other citizens, both youth and adults, are uncoun ted in unemployment statistics because, in addition to being unemployed, they have given up and are not even seeking work. Another 5.5 million American workers are underemployed. This means more than 11 million American bread-winners--either unemployed or underemployed, cannot make the money they need to provide for their families.

In the public schools of the United States, the high school dropout rate still exceeds 25 per cent. Nationally, more than 80 per cent

of all secondary school students are enrolled in either a college preparatory or a general curriculum, yet we know that no more than 17 per cent of these students will ever attain a college degree.

Record numbers of persons are enrolled in four year colleges and universities of the nation. Academically, these students are better prepared for college than at any time in history. Yet, the college dropout rate (40 per cent prior to the junior year and 50 per cent prior to graduation) is staggering. Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of these college students have no clear-cut vocational goals. The resulting student unrest, disenchantment, and discontent is a strong and pervasive force on college campuses throughout the nation. These youngsters are the tragic victims of an educational policy that too often teaches young people to do nothing.

Admittedly, hundreds of thousands of out-of-school youths and adults have been enrolled in a wide variety of manpower programs during the last decade. Still, our unemployment rate has not been markedly reduced, and the incidence of crime and violence continues to increase.

Finally, enrollments at vocational institutions, while increasing, continue to lag far behind those said to be needed. The integration and acceptance of occupational education as an integral part of American education has not taken place in the minds and thoughts of those who control American education. Those who enroll in vocational education are still too often regarded by most persons as second class citizens who have made second best choices.

At the heart of the problem is a false societal attitude that worships a college degree as the best and surest route to occupational success. This attitude is as dangerous as it is false. When less than 17 per cent of the population can attain what close to 100 per cent of the population have been led to believe is desirable, it is inevitable that the majority must be dissatisfied with their lot. A viable democracy cannot afford to view 83 per cent of its population as "second class citizens." Unrest is sure to exist when only one-third can try and less than one-sixth attain what more than nine-tenths, albeit falsely, regard as the optimal pattern of education as preparation for the world of work.

I believe that these problems will be corrected only by a massive reform of our educational system. We must turn the system around and those of you in this room today have the power for this turn around.

Historically, the two basic purposes of American education have been pictured as (a) preparation for living, and (b) preparation for making a living. In practice, however, the first has vastly overshadowed the second. No suggestion is being made here that the first be replaced by the second. Rather, we are pleading for changes that will recognize and implement the equal importance of both.

Today, education's prime purpose seems simply to be education. In many systems, we're not even sure what that means. In Chicago, it wasn't until yesterday, imagine--April, 1971, that the board finally agreed to give reading top priority. Are you surprised then, that millions of Americans are disenchanted with their school system! In the eyes of the typical classroom teacher, the prime operational purpose of education seems to be readying students for more education. It is time to halt, as Dr. Rupert Evans has said, a "schooling for schooling's sake" emphasis in American education. To accomplish this, it will be necessary that the purpose of education in every classroom be clearly seen as preparation for living, as preparation for making a living, or in most cases, as some combination of these two basic purposes.

The prime substantive solution, I believe, lies in instilling a career development emphasis in all of American education, and at the earliest level.

The concept of career development can best be implemented in our educational programs through the re-dedication to the idea that education as preparation for the world of work is a major purpose of American education. I believe that this can best be accomplished by enactment of education legislation centered around the concept of career development and education.

I would now like to describe to you several basic components of this legislation which I am contemplating.

One essential ingredient of career development legislation must be concerned with changing attitudes of professional educators towards work and towards education as preparation for work. In this portion of the legislation, there may be provisions for elementary and secondary school teachers to visit business and industrial settings, to acquire work experience in business and industry, and to reformulate their instructional objectives and programs in terms of providing a proper emphasis on education as preparation for work. Equal attention must be given to providing school administrators with in-service education and bonafide work experience in the occupational world outside the structure for formal education. Special attention must be given to a program of re-educating school counselors in both elementary and secondary school settings to education as preparation for work with appropriate attention directed towards changing counselor attitudes and providing counselors with a variety of kinds of work experience and opportunities to interact with members of business, industry, and labor. In addition to providing multiple opportunities for educators to gain experience in and exposure to business and industry, this legislation could provide means for members of the business, labor, and industrial community to assume an active role in the school's total program of career development. This may require some in-service education for such personnel along with stipends and employer rebates that will make their active participation possible.

A second essential ingredient may be a massive effort aimed at restructuring curricula and instructional materials in American education so as to reflect a career development emphasis. The career implications of every subject should be emphasized in a variety of ways both through instructional materials and through instructional content. While this emphasis is needed throughout the curriculum, it will be especially important in the social studies parts of elementary and secondary education. Provision may be made in this legislation for a multi-media approach to development and use of instructional materials. The technology for doing so is already present. Special emphasis may be given to development of materials appropriate for use in adult education.

A third ingredient may be massive support for effective programs of individual and occupational assessment as essential bases for programs of career development. It will be especially important that provision be made for allowing persons "hands on" experiences as part of occupational exploration. The use of simulated work experience as a means of testing both aptitude and interest must be greatly expanded. Similar simulation techniques must be developed, validated, and implemented for allowing persons to discover their abilities and interests with respect to programs of occupational education at the secondary and post-secondary levels. Followup studies of graduates of occupational education programs must be funded as part of this data base. Similarly, provisions must be made for securing, analyzing, and disseminating job placement and occupational information pertinent to entry occupations available to those leaving schools with particular sets of skills. All forms of educational technology, including (but not limited to) the use of computers, may be included in legislative provisions for this ingredient.

Fourth, an essential ingredient in this legislation may be provision for the education and employment of specialized career development personnel. It must, obviously, begin with support for instructional personnel in occupational education. If it is to be effective, it must also include a wide variety of support personnel such as outreach or followup technicians, assessment technicians, and placement and job development specialists. It may also include provisions, at every level, for professional career development counselors. Such counselors will be essential for ensuring the freedom of choice, assistance in occupational and educational decision making, and the formulation of plans for implementing such decisions that is the birthright of every American.

A fifth essential ingredient in this legislation may consist of support for research in extending our knowledge and competency in the area of career development. Much remains to be learned regarding occupational choice theory, occupational decision making, the dynamics of relationships between education and occupations, occupational assessment, the transition from school to work, and a host of other key topics. A research support ingredient must be a key part of any comprehensive career development legislation.

Finally, a sixth essential ingredient must be provision for your national, state, regional or local advisory councils to play a greater role in career development programs. You may want to have a series of neighborhood councils which would include persons from education, from business, industry, labor, the general community, related advisory councils, and students (both youths and adults) who are currently enrolled in schools, and who could work together in seeking ways to improve the education for themselves and their communities. These neighborhood councils would be under your control and jurisdiction and report directly to the State Advisory Board. I believe the United States Employment Service should also be more closely tied to your advisory boards so it can serve as your radar in career needs.

Now let me describe for you how I visualize these six components affecting the various levels of schooling.

At elementary school level, we must help students acquire positive attitudes towards work, towards all levels of occupations found in the society, and towards themselves as prospective workers. We should also provide for introduction of some "hands on" acquaintance with both tools and machines as an essential part of the curriculum. And we must provide opportunities for elementary school students to visit in the occupational world and for representatives from that world to visit with students in their elementary schools. The cooperative work study program should be vastly expanded to help achieve this goal.

At the junior high school level, we must have career exploration in broad career fields for all students through a combination of classroom instruction, counseling, and actual experiences. Here, the concept of work experience should be introduced as part of the program of career development. Here, too, all students should be exposed to the nature of their potential for profiting from senior high school programs of occupational education through simulation experiences. Visits to senior high school vocational education facilities and to business and industry should be an essential part of career development programs in the junior high school.

At the senior high school level, the emphasis on career implications of all courses should be especially emphasized. It is vital that those who, after high school, will attend four year colleges and universities be assisted in thinking about such decisions in terms of their implication for career development. It will be essential that comprehensive programs of occupational education be made available to every senior high school student either as part of a comprehensive high school or in a separate area vocational school facility. Such occupational education programs should be of a multi-purpose nature. For some students, they will be used for further career exploration. For others, these programs will provide basic skills required for employment after leaving high school. Job placement and followup will be essential ingredients here. For still others, these programs will offer basic vocational training that will give students both a basis for choosing and a basis for succeeding in post high school programs of occupational education.

At the post high school level, programs of occupational education at less than the baccalaureate level should be available to all who desire and can profit from them. Comprehensive career development legislation must provide support for such programs in a wide variety of settings including residential vocational schools, community colleges, and those private business and vocational schools which meet rigid state standards. This legislation should also provide subsidies for students attending such schools that, by being made directly available to the student, will allow the student to choose the particular school that best meets his needs. Institutions eligible to participate under this legislation must be limited to those who are willing to provide valid product evaluation data regarding the occupational experiences of their graduates. Once again, job placement and followup will be essential ingredients in this process.

We want to work with you. We're going to try to work very closely with you. We want to hear from you, and I want to congratulate you.

I think you all will find a tremendous source of satisfaction. May I conclude by just telling you one thing: we get a tremendous number of people today who come to us and say Congressman, I wonder if I can get a job with you? Now, I don't need work, but I feel that I've got to do something creative. I want to be in a position where I can make some kind of a contribution. This is happening all over the country. We Americans are looking for greater expression. I would tell you that nobody has an opportunity for that kind of creativity and expression more than you.

The first thing is to understand what you're doing. Secondly, be resolute. You're going to have to stand up and be willing to take a risk. American education has been lagging simply because we don't have enough risk takers. It's an awesome responsibility. You're dealing with human beings. Young people whose lives may be affected by every judgment and decision that you make, and may be affected for all their lives.

We are estimating that the average American worker is going to change job skills four times in his working lifetime. So, you've got to prepare a system in your community that will prepare young people, middle-aged people and old people. Education has to be a continuing process because --What a fantastic responsibility you've got. I'll tell you this: somewhere along the line here, before this convention is over, if you will just pause and think it through yourself--Think about the tremendous opportunity that you as an individual have to turn America's educational system around and indeed, giving Americans the magnificent opportunities that are there. This is the greatest country in the world. You can transmit that greatness to the young people that you serve, if you just have the courage to change.

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWRENCE DAVENPORT, CHAIRMAN, NACVE

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

We of the National Council are very, very happy to be in Texas. We're very, very happy that the Texas Advisory Council and our member from the National Council, Dr. Morton, invited us to Texas. It's been everything that we could imagine. It's been a pleasure to participate in the young peoples' program of DECA here; it's been inspiring to watch how they make such large problems so simple, so that even I as an educator could understand. It sets sort of a pattern for us. If we in education could learn something from how those young people handled some 4,000 people in a room the other day, and I remember going to my professional association meetings, I'm not going to name them; and, they did not run that smoothly.



So, if you are going to learn something, I would point out to you what the DECA groups have accomplished; FHA, and other groups and that we begin to take something that they have taken to be a winner and also adapt ourselves to working with those groups.

We, on the National Council, the twenty members on the Council, hope to over the next period of a year, spread the gospel throughout this country. It's almost like: Have Speech - Will Travel. And, we hope that when we are in your area, that you will take the time to talk with us, provide the information that is necessary to keep this whole machinery working.

So as we leave here today, we'd like to say thanks once again, for participating with us in this partnership towards running this whole concept of vocational education around in America. We appreciate the dedication, the thoughtfulness, and even when you tell us when we're wrong, we appreciate that, too. Thank you very much.

LIST OF DELEGATES IN ATTENDANCE

DELEGATES IN ATTENDANCE

Alabama

Mrs. Dorothy Chambers
Mr. Henry Morgan

Alaska

Mr. Chuck Conway

Arizona

Mr. F. R. Vihel

Arkansas

Mr. Lanny Hassell
Mr. Daniel Woods

California

Mr. Karl Kolb
Dr. Allison J. McNay

Colorado

Mr. S. L. Witwer
Mr. Irwin A. MacKay

Connecticut

Mrs. Adge Solomon

Delaware

Mr. Irwin Chelly
Mrs. Martha Bachman
Mr. George McGorman
Mr. F. Robert Mercer

District of Columbia

Dr. Frank Gregory
Mrs. Lillie Sampson

Florida

Mr. John Beaumont
Mr. Walter Clausen
Mr. Wm. Bruce Howell

Georgia

Mr. Don Cargill
Dr. Charles McDaniel

Idaho

Mr. Vernon Exner

Illinois

Mr. Don Truitt
Mr. Bill Nagel

Indiana

Mr. Richard Goshurt

Iowa

Mr. Robert Koons
Mr. Harlan Giese

Hawaii

Mr. James J. M. Misajon

Kansas

Mr. Murle Hayden

Kentucky

Mr. Billy Howard
Mr. E. P. Milton

Louisiana

Mr. D. H. Whittington

Maryland

Mr. Max Jobe
Mr. J. W. Paul
Mr. Alexander Bell

Massachusetts

Mr. Leo Renaud

Massachusetts (cont.)

Mr. Kenneth Kelly

Michigan

Mr. Lawrence Davenport

Minnesota

Mrs. Ruth Crassweller
Miss Chynne Koser

Mississippi

Mr. James Eason, Sr.
Mr. J. P. Fatherree
Mr. Orval Simmons
Mr. Harold White

Missouri

Mr. Gordon Kutscher
Mr. Billy Bruns

Montana

Mr. William Ball
Mrs. Lina Skarr

Nebraska

Dr. C. A. Cromer
Mr. Bill Ptacek

Nevada

Mr. Courtney Riley

New Hampshire

Mr. A. J. Moynihan
Mr. Bill Elliot
Mr. Armand St. Pierre

New Jersey

Mr. R. J. Girandola

New Mexico

Mr. Mel McCutchan

New York

Mr. John Briscoe
Mr. J. Walter Juckett
Mr. Lawrence Burwell

North Carolina

Mr. Joe Clary

North Dakota

Mr. DeForest Rall

Ohio

Mr. Warren Weiler
Mr. Jesse W. Fulton

Oklahoma

Mr. Roy Stewart
Mrs. Caroline Hughes

Oregon

Mr. Terrence James
Mr. George Mitton

Puerto Rico

Mr. Antonio Figueroa-Colon

Rhode Island

Mr. T. D. Weller
Mr. W. F. Carroll

South Carolina

Dr. Robert H. White

South Dakota

Mr. H. D. Buckingham

Tennessee

Mr. W. M. Harrison

Texas

Mr. E. D. Redding
Mr. Vernon McGee
Mr. John L. Cockrill
Mr. S. P. Cowan
Mr. Jack Stubbs
Mr. W. T. Crouch
Mr. Roy B. Davis
Dr. Roy Dugger
Mr. Romeo Escobar
Mrs. Gwendolyn Foster
Mr. John R. Guemple
Mr. Roff W. Hardy
Mr. W. L. Jones, Jr.
Dr. Luis Morton, Jr.
Mrs. Dorothy Robinson
Dr. Richard Strahan
Mr. W. H. Townsend
Mr. Marcos Vann

Utah

Mr. Jack Higbee
Mr. Richard Prows

Vermont

Mr. Dick Collins
Mr. Pelton Goudey

Virginia

Mr. A. L. Walker
Dr. Rufus Beamer

Washington

Dr. Bob Wallenstein

Wisconsin

Mrs. Margaret Neilson

Wyoming

Mr. R. Harris
Mr. Robert Naylor